

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated December 31 2002. After this amendment only claim 27 remains. All other claims have been canceled.


In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Melville in view of Gelbart. In particular, the Examiner states "Melville fails to teach the resonant reflector is a microelectromechanical membrane.... It would have been obvious... to utilize the micromachined having deformable mirror and membrane taught by Gelbart in Melville's scanning device because this would provide a fast response time combined with high contrast."

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants first note that the structure defined by Gelbart is a "light valve." Essentially, the light valve of Gelbart is an intensity modulator (when combined with a stop). Thus, Gelbart does not relate to a resonant MEMS device that would be used with a scanning system. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion of a structure having a combination of a primary scanning mirror having a scanning period defining a scanning frequency with a resonant reflector, where scanning frequency is an integral multiple of the resonant frequency.

The Examiner is invited to contact Mr. Casey T. Tegreene at (425) 415-6621 with any issues that may advance prosecution of the application on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

David Dickensheets, et al.



Clarence T. Tegreene
Registration No. 37,951

CTT:pl